

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : María Teresa Moreno Flores et al.
Serial No. : 10/564,466
Filed : October 27, 2006
Title : REVERSIBLY IMMORTALISED OLFACTORY ENSHEATHING GLIA AND THEIR USE TO PROMOTE NEURONAL REGENERATION

Art Unit : 1632
Examiner : Thaian N. Ton
Conf. No. : 5995

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

[1] This paper is responsive to an Interview Summary that was issued by the Office in connection with the above-referenced case (“the Office Interview Summary”). The interview was conducted on October 14, 2010. The mail date of the Office Interview Summary is October 20, 2010. The Office Interview Summary states, in part (upper case in original):

If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Since a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, it is respectfully submitted that any accrued patent term adjustment for this application should not be adversely affected (e.g., decreased) by the filing of this paper and the accompanying Information Disclosure Statement. In addition, this paper is being filed within one month of the mail date of the Office Interview Summary and therefore believed to be filed within the time period specified in the Office Interview Summary (*supra*).

[2] Applicants agree, in general, with the Examiner’s summary of the telephonic interview conducted on October 14, 2010. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for her courtesy and helpful comments.

Applicants wish to supplement the Examiner’s Interview Summary with the following comments. Applicants discussed the Office's comments on page 6 of the Office Action, in

particular the Office's characterization of page 408 of the Salmon reference. Agreement appeared to be reached that Salmon does not teach the phenotype or phenotypic markers of Salmon's reverse immortalised (deimmortalized) cells, i.e., cells in which the DNA construct containing the immortalising transgenes had been excised. Applicants also pointed to passages in Salmon that would lead one to reasonably conclude that not all cell types will retain their functional properties following the process of immortalization – deimmortalization. Finally, Applicants indicated that the focus of the arguments presented in their response would be that based on the prior art of record, it could not be expected with a reasonable expectation of success that reverse immortalised OEG cells would be able to promote axonal regeneration from adult CNS neurons.

No fee is believed due. Please apply all charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 14829-0003US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2010

/John T. Kendall/

John T. Kendall, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 50,680

Fish & Richardson P.C.
One Marina Park Drive
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-1878

Telephone: (617) 542-5070

Facsimile: (877) 769-7945